



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/910,388	07/20/2001	Lawrence L. Kunz	295.003US5	1690
20583	7590	05/29/2008		
JONES DAY 222 EAST 41ST ST NEW YORK, NY 10017			EXAMINER ROBINSON, HOPE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1652	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/29/2008 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/910,388

Applicant(s)

KUNZ, LAWRENCE L.

Examiner

HOPE A. ROBINSON

Art Unit

1652

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 50 and 52-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 50, 52-65 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 2/29/01 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C2)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/20/08, 8/29/07
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Application Status

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 19, 2008 has been entered.

Claim Disposition

2. Claims 60-65 have been added. Claims 50, 52-65 are pending and are under examination.

Maintained-Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 50 and 52-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, written description, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims recite added material, which is not supported by the original disclosure. Claim 50 (and dependent claims 52-65) recite "cytostatic amount" and no support was found in the instant specification for this language, which describes an "effective amount". In addition no support was found for the language "wherein said cytostatic agent, anti-migratory agent, cytoskeletal inhibitor and anti-matrix agent are not heparin, a radioisotope, a nitric oxide-releasing compound, suramin, methotrexate, adriamycin, a protein kinase inhibitor, staurosporin, an antisense oligonucleotide, colchicine, a peptidic inhibitor of a cellular factor that riggers proliferation of a smooth muscle cell or a pericyte, a growth factor inhibitor, as smooth muscle-derived growth factor inhibitor, an endothelial-derived growth factor inhibitor, a platelet homing receptor inhibitor, an integrin inhibitor, triazolopyrimidine or a prostaglandin" (emphasis added). It is noted that applicant points to pages for example 30-32 of the specification, however, no support was found throughout the entire specification for the aforementioned language. It is suggested that the new matter is deleted from the specification and claims. Therefore, the specification lacks adequate written description.

In addition, the claims as amended are directed to a genus of cytostatic agents, anti-migratory agents, cytoskeletal inhibitors, and anti-matrix agents and claim 50 for

example recites a laundry list of what is considered not to be in said list. However, note the specification in for example paragraph [0099] provides disclosure of several items on the recited list that are disclosed as being "cytostatic agents". Furthermore, there is no one to one correspondence between the listing of agents and which are considered to be specifically anti-migratory or anti-matrix for example.

The claims encompass a large genus of agents not adequately described. Thus, one of skill in the art would be unable to predict the structure of other members of this genus by virtue of the instant disclosure. The specification fails to provide any additional representative species of the claimed genus, to show that applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. A representative number of species means that the species, which are adequately described, are representative of the entire genus. The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, disclosure of drawings, or by disclosure of relevant identifying characteristics, for example, structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus.

Further, *Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Fed. Cir.1991), states that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in *possession of the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is*

now claimed" (See page 1117). The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed" (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). The skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed genus of polypeptides, and therefore, conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993). Therefore, for all these reasons the specification lacks adequate written description, and one of skill in the art cannot reasonably conclude that the applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time the instant application was filed.

Response to Applicant's Arguments:

4. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered. Note that the rejections of record have been withdrawn, however, a new ground of rejection has been instituted under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, written description, for the reasons stated above. As the rejections of record have been withdrawn applicant's comments are moot and will not be addressed herein.

Conclusion

5. No claims are presently allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HOPE A. ROBINSON whose telephone number is (571)272-0957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00-6:30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nashaat T. Nashed, PhD., can be reached at (571) 272-09234. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Hope A. Robinson/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1652

